



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/750,003	12/30/2003	Ingo Zenz	6570P016	9941

8791 7590 12/08/2006

BLAKELY SOKOLOFF TAYLOR & ZAFMAN
12400 WILSHIRE BOULEVARD
SEVENTH FLOOR
LOS ANGELES, CA 90025-1030

EXAMINER

MORRISON, JAY A

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2168	

DATE MAILED: 12/08/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/750,003

Applicant(s)

ZENZ, INGO

Examiner

Jay A. Morrison

Art Unit

2168

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 02 October 2006.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-6, 8-10 and 16-28 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-6, 8-10 and 16-28 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 30 December 2003 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
- ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 - ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 - ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

Remarks

1. Claims 1-6,8-10,16-28

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

2. The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

3. Claims 9,25,28 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

Regarding claims 9,25,28, the phrase "if" or "may be" renders the claim indefinite because it is unclear whether the limitations following the phrase are part of the claimed invention. See MPEP § 2173.05(d).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

4. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Art Unit: 2168

5. Claims 1-2,6,8-10,16-19,26 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Rubert et al. ('Rubert' hereinafter) (Patent Number 6,366,915) in view of Gudjonsson et al. ('Gudjonsson' hereinafter) (Patent Number 6,564,261).

As per claim 1, Rubert teaches

"A property sheet system comprising:" (see abstract and background)

"including a plurality of property names, a plurality of non-modifiable parameters and a plurality of modifiable parameters, wherein each respective property name included in the property sheet data structure is associated with a non-modifiable parameter and optionally a modifiable parameter; and a user interface to display contents of the property sheet data structure", "the user interface to receive inputs to select and modify a parameter associated with the property sheet data structure" (column 5, line 55 through column 6, line 6).

Rubert does not explicitly indicate "a property sheet data structure representing configuration information associated with at least one component within a clustered system", "to allow centralized management of the clustered system".

However, Gudjonsson discloses "a property sheet data structure representing configuration information associated with at least one component within a clustered system", "to allow centralized management of the clustered system" (column 18, lines 24-28).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to combine Rubert and Gudjonsson because using the steps of "a property sheet data structure

Art Unit: 2168

representing configuration information associated with at least one component within a clustered system", "to allow centralized management of the clustered system" would have given those skilled in the art the tools to improve the invention by making information available and configurable centrally. This gives the user the advantage of having a simple way to configure components.

As per claim 2,

Rubert does not explicitly indicate "the property sheet data structure is associated with a plurality of components contained within a clustered system".

However, Gudjonsson discloses "the property sheet data structure is associated with a plurality of components contained within a clustered system" (column 18, lines 24-28).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to combine Rubert and Gudjonsson because using the steps of "the property sheet data structure is associated with a plurality of components contained within a clustered system" would have given those skilled in the art the tools to improve the invention by making information available and configurable centrally. This gives the user the advantage of having a simple way to configure components.

As per claim 6, Rubert teaches

"A method comprising:" (see abstract and background)

“providing a property sheet”, “the property sheet including a plurality of configuration parameters, each parameter associated with a name, a default parameter and optionally a custom parameter”, “default parameters” (column 5, line 55 through column 6, line 6);

Rubert does not explicitly indicate “associated with a component contained within a clustered system”, “changing the component contained within the clustered system; and automatically updating the ... parameters included in the property sheet with a different default parameter with a corresponding property of a replacement component in response to changing the component”.

However, Gudjonsson discloses “associated with a component contained within a clustered system”, “changing the component contained within the clustered system; and automatically updating the ... parameters included in the property sheet with a different default parameter with a corresponding property of a replacement component in response to changing the component” (column 18, lines 24-28).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to combine Rubert and Gudjonsson because using the steps of “associated with a component contained within a clustered system”, “changing the component contained within the clustered system; and automatically updating the ... parameters included in the property sheet with a different default parameter with a corresponding property of a replacement component in response to changing the component” would have given those skilled in the art the tools to improve the invention by making information available and

Art Unit: 2168

configurable centrally. This gives the user the advantage of having a simple way to configure components.

As per claim 8, Rubert teaches

“determining if a custom parameter included in the property sheet is valid with the changed component” (column 5, line 55 through column 6, line 6).

As per claim 9, Rubert teaches

“deselecting the custom parameter if the custom parameter is not valid with the changed component” (optionally recited limitations are not required to be taught by the Office, see MPEP § 2106 Section II(C)).

As per claim 10,

Rubert does not explicitly indicate “the cluster includes a plurality of instances”.

However, Gudjonsson discloses “the cluster includes a plurality of instances” (plurality of clusters, column 7, lines 35-40).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to combine Rubert and Gudjonsson because using the steps of “the cluster includes a plurality of instances” would have given those skilled in the art the tools to improve the invention by making information available and configurable centrally. This gives the user the advantage of having a simple way to configure components.

As per claim 16, Rubert teaches

A method comprising:” (see abstract and background)

“displaying contents of the property sheet, the property sheet including non-modifiable parameters and modifiable parameters; and receiving input to select and modify a parameter of the displayed property sheet” (column 5, line 55 through column 6, line 6).

Rubert does not explicitly indicate “providing a property sheet containing configuration information associated with a component contained within a cluster”.

However, Gudjonsson discloses “providing a property sheet containing configuration information associated with a component contained within a cluster” (column 18, lines 24-28);

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to combine Rubert and Gudjonsson because using the steps of “providing a property sheet containing configuration information associated with a component contained within a cluster” would have given those skilled in the art the tools to improve the invention by making information available and configurable centrally. This gives the user the advantage of having a simple way to configure components.

As per claim 17, Rubert teaches

“the displaying contents of a property sheet comprises: providing a number of entry rows; displaying names of corresponding properties in a first column of each entry row; displaying configuration parameters associated with corresponding properties in a

second column of each entry row; and indicating if a configuration parameter displayed in the second column is a default parameter or a custom parameter" (column 5, line 55 through column 6, line 6).

As per claim 18,

Rubert does not explicitly indicate "the property sheet is included in a configuration data structure containing configuration information associated with the cluster".

However, Gudjonsson discloses "the property sheet is included in a configuration data structure containing configuration information associated with the cluster" (column 18, lines 24-28).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to combine Rubert and Gudjonsson because using the steps of "the property sheet is included in a configuration data structure containing configuration information associated with the cluster" would have given those skilled in the art the tools to improve the invention by making information available and configurable centrally. This gives the user the advantage of having a simple way to configure components.

As per claim 19, Rubert teaches

"A system comprising:" (see abstract and background)

"means for displaying contents of a property sheet", "the property sheet having a plurality of properties, wherein each of said properties is associated with a property

Art Unit: 2168

name, a non-modifiable default parameter and optionally a custom parameter; and means for receiving input to select and modify a parameter associated with a property included in the property sheet" (column 5, line 55 through column 6, line 6).

Rubert does not explicitly indicate "containing configuration information associated with a component contained within a clustered system"

However, Gudjonsson discloses "containing configuration information associated with a component contained within a clustered system" (column 18, lines 24-28).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to combine Rubert and Gudjonsson because using the steps of "containing configuration information associated with a component contained within a clustered system" would have given those skilled in the art the tools to improve the invention by making information available and configurable centrally. This gives the user the advantage of having a simple way to configure components.

As per claim 26, Rubert teaches

"A machine-readable medium that provides instructions, which when executed by a processor cause the processor to perform operations comprising:" (see abstract and background)

"displaying contents of a property sheet data structure", "the property sheet data structure including a plurality of property names, a plurality of non-modifiable default parameters and a plurality of custom parameters; receiving input to select a custom parameter included in the property sheet data structure; receiving input to modify the

Art Unit: 2168

selected custom parameter; and storing the modified custom parameter without changing a default parameter corresponding to the modified custom parameter" (column 5, line 55 through column 6, line 6).

Rubert does not explicitly indicate "representing configuration information associated with at least one component within a clustered system".

However, Gudjonsson discloses "representing configuration information associated with at least one component within a clustered system" (column 18, lines 24-28).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to combine Rubert and Gudjonsson because using the steps of "representing configuration information associated with at least one component within a clustered system" would have given those skilled in the art the tools to improve the invention by making information available and configurable centrally. This gives the user the advantage of having a simple way to configure components.

6. Claims 3-5,20-25,27-28 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Rubert et al. ('Rubert' hereinafter) (Patent Number 6,366,915) in view of Tanner et al. ('Tanner' hereinafter) (Publication Number 2005/0114315).

As per claim 3,

Rubert does not explicitly indicate "the user interface comprises: a first dialog box to display contents of the property sheet data structure, the first dialog box including a

plurality of entry rows, the entry rows including a first column to display names of corresponding properties, a second column to display configuration parameters associated with the corresponding properties and a third column to indicate if the configuration parameters are default or custom parameters; and a second dialog box to receive input to modify a custom parameter”.

However, Tanner discloses “the user interface comprises: a first dialog box to display contents of the property sheet data structure, the first dialog box including a plurality of entry rows, the entry rows including a first column to display names of corresponding properties, a second column to display configuration parameters associated with the corresponding properties and a third column to indicate if the configuration parameters are default or custom parameters; and a second dialog box to receive input to modify a custom parameter” (paragraphs [0065]-[0066]).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to combine Rubert and Tanner because using the steps of “the user interface comprises: a first dialog box to display contents of the property sheet data structure, the first dialog box including a plurality of entry rows, the entry rows including a first column to display names of corresponding properties, a second column to display configuration parameters associated with the corresponding properties and a third column to indicate if the configuration parameters are default or custom parameters; and a second dialog box to receive input to modify a custom parameter” would have given those skilled in the art the tools to improve the invention by avoiding errors when entering data. This gives the user the advantage of having a standardized entry application:

As per claim 4,

Rubert does not explicitly indicate “the second dialog box further includes a name field to display a name of a corresponding property and a default field to display a default configuration parameter associated with the corresponding property”.

However, Tanner discloses “the second dialog box further includes a name field to display a name of a corresponding property and a default field to display a default configuration parameter associated with the corresponding property” (paragraphs [0065]-[0066]).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to combine Rubert and Tanner because using the steps of “the second dialog box further includes a name field to display a name of a corresponding property and a default field to display a default configuration parameter associated with the corresponding property” would have given those skilled in the art the tools to improve the invention by avoiding errors when entering data. This gives the user the advantage of having a standardized entry application.

As per claim 5,

Rubert does not explicitly indicate “the second dialog box further includes a data type field to display the data type associated with corresponding property”.

However, Tanner discloses “the second dialog box further includes a data type field to display the data type associated with corresponding property” (paragraphs [0065]-[0066]).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to combine Rubert and Tanner because using the steps of “the second dialog box further includes a data type field to display the data type associated with corresponding property” would have given those skilled in the art the tools to improve the invention by avoiding errors when entering data. This gives the user the advantage of having a standardized entry application.

As per claim 20,

Rubert does not explicitly indicate “means for receiving input to select between the default parameter and the custom parameter to be applied to a property included in the property sheet”.

However, Tanner discloses “means for receiving input to select between the default parameter and the custom parameter to be applied to a property included in the property sheet” (paragraphs [0065]-[0066]).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to combine Rubert and Tanner because using the steps of “means for receiving input to select between the default parameter and the custom parameter to be applied to a property included in the property sheet” would have given those skilled in the art the tools to improve the

invention by avoiding errors when entering data. This gives the user the advantage of having a standardized entry application.

As per claim 21, Rubert teaches

“the means for displaying further comprises: means for indicating if a configuration parameter displayed by the means for displaying is a default parameter or a custom parameter” (column 5, line 55 through column 6, line 6).

As per claim 22,

Rubert does not explicitly indicate “means for selectively updating the parameters included in the property sheet in response to changing of a component”.

However, Tanner discloses “means for selectively updating the parameters included in the property sheet in response to changing of a component” (paragraphs [0065]-[0066]).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to combine Rubert and Tanner because using the steps of “means for selectively updating the parameters included in the property sheet in response to changing of a component” would have given those skilled in the art the tools to improve the invention by avoiding errors when entering data. This gives the user the advantage of having a standardized entry application.

As per claim 23,

Rubert does not explicitly indicate "means for automatically updating a default parameter included in the property sheet with a different default parameter associated with a corresponding property of the changed component".

However, Tanner discloses "means for automatically updating a default parameter included in the property sheet with a different default parameter associated with a corresponding property of the changed component" (paragraphs [0065]-[0066]).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to combine Rubert and Tanner because using the steps of "means for automatically updating a default parameter included in the property sheet with a different default parameter associated with a corresponding property of the changed component" would have given those skilled in the art the tools to improve the invention by avoiding errors when entering data. This gives the user the advantage of having a standardized entry application.

As per claim 24, Rubert teaches

"means for determining if a custom parameter included in the property sheet is valid with the changed component" (column 5, line 55 through column 6, line 6).

As per claim 25, Rubert teaches

"means for deselecting a custom parameter if the custom parameter is not valid with the changed component" (optionally recited limitations are not required to be taught by the Office, see MPEP § 2106 Section II(C)).

As per claim 27,

Rubert does not explicitly indicate “the operations performed by the processor further comprise: selectively updating the parameters included in the property sheet data structure in response to changing of a component”.

However, Tanner discloses “the operations performed by the processor further comprise: selectively updating the parameters included in the property sheet data structure in response to changing of a component” (paragraphs [0065]-[0066]).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to combine Rubert and Tanner because using the steps of “the second dialog box further includes a data type field to display the data type associated with corresponding property” would have given those skilled in the art the tools to improve the invention by avoiding errors when entering data. This gives the user the advantage of having a standardized entry application.

As per claim 28, Rubert teaches

“determining if a custom parameter included in the property sheet data structure is valid with the changed component” (column 5, line 55 through column 6, line 6);

“and deselecting an applied custom parameter if the applied custom parameter is not valid with the changed component” (optionally recited limitations are not required to be taught by the Office, see MPEP § 2106 Section II(C)).

Rubert does not explicitly indicate “the operations performed by the processor further comprise: automatically updating a default parameter included in the property

Art Unit: 2168

sheet data structure with a different default parameter associated with a corresponding property of the changed component”.

However, Tanner discloses “the operations performed by the processor further comprise: automatically updating a default parameter included in the property sheet data structure with a different default parameter associated with a corresponding property of the changed component” (paragraphs [0065]-[0066]);

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to combine Rubert and Tanner because using the steps of “the second dialog box further includes a data type field to display the data type associated with corresponding property” would have given those skilled in the art the tools to improve the invention by avoiding errors when entering data. This gives the user the advantage of having a standardized entry application.

Response to Arguments

7. Regarding Applicant’s arguments with respect to the rejections under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, regarding claims 9,25,28, these rejections are maintained. It is noted that the phrase “if” or “may be” renders the claim indefinite because it is unclear whether the limitations following the phrase are part of the claimed invention. See MPEP § 2173.05(d). To further assist the Applicant to understand the basis of the rejection, the Applicant is directed to MPEP § 2106 II(C).

Art Unit: 2168

8. Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1,19,26 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

9. Applicant's arguments filed 10/2/2006 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

With regards to various claims where Applicant argues that Rubert in view of Gudjonsson does not disclose a property sheet data structure representing configuration information associated with at least on component within a clustered system, it is noted that Rubert discloses the equivalent of a property data sheet with parameters (column 5, lines 55-65), and Gudjonsson discloses administrative tools which allow administrators to change settings within a cluster, this data being abstracted into a data structure (column 18, lines 24-35). Therefore it is respectfully submitted Rubert in view of Gudjonsson discloses the limitation.

With regards to various claims where Applicant argues that Rubert in view of Gudjonsson does not disclose changing the component contained within the clustered system and automatically updating the default parameters included in the property sheet with a different default parameter with a corresponding property of the component in response to changing the component, it is noted that Rubert discloses retrieving information and default values (column 5, lines 55-65), and Gudjonsson discloses not only notifying the components in a cluster but a unified database for management and

Art Unit: 2168

administration of this data (column 18, lines 15-35), and in this way parameters can be updated. Therefore it is respectfully submitted Rubert in view of Gudjonsson discloses the limitation.

Conclusion

10. **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

The prior art made of record, listed on form PTO-892, and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Jay A. Morrison whose telephone number is (571) 272-7112. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F 8-4:30.

Art Unit: 2168

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Tim Vo can be reached on (571) 272-3642. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).



TIM VO
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2100

Jay Morrison
TC2100



Tim Vo
TC2100